

[4th March 1925]

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“ Was the report sent to the chairman before the orders were passed or was the order first issued and then the report sent to the chairman ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Government did not consider it necessary ; because the special officer reported upon the materials available on the spot.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Did the Inspector of Municipalities take any explanation from the chairman of the council before he sent his report ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I am not quite sure whether he took any explanation or not. But my impression is that he had the chairman's explanation.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, the answer to the question says that an order was passed on the report of the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipal Councils. And the latter portion of it merely says that subsequently the chairman sent in an explanation and the Government were satisfied that except in regard to a trivial matter the facts were as reported by the Inspector. Now the hon. the Minister says that final orders were passed after the explanation of the chairman was received. But the answer refers to only one order which was passed before the explanation of the chairman was received. May I know under what rules Government passed such an order without taking the explanation of the person concerned ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ It is left to the discretion of the Government whether to take explanations or not.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“ Is there any precedent in any department of the Government where disciplinary orders have been passed without taking the explanation of the person concerned ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I am not sure, Sir, when a special officer is appointed to enquire into the matter and when he enquires into the matter carefully and submits a report, whether it is necessary to take further explanation from the person concerned.”

Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ May I ask why this method was not adopted in the case of the Dindigul municipality ? ”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask whether final orders were as a matter of fact passed and if so the date of the final orders ? I want to know whether on receipt and consideration of the explanation of the chairman final orders were passed as a matter of fact or whether it is simply a matter of memory. If the final orders were actually passed, what is the date of the orders ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I cannot remember the date, Sir.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ The number of the Government Order ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I want notice, Sir.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Were final orders passed at all ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Yes, Sir.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Did they differ in any material detail from the original orders passed ? ”



4th March 1925]

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I do not think it necessary to answer that question.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Was any order passed after the receipt and consideration by the Government of the explanation of the municipal chairman ?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I have answered that question, Sir.”

*Explanation of the chairman, Trichinopoly municipality, on the report of the Inspector of Municipalities.*

\* 317 Q.—Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have been supplied with explanations by the chairman of the Trichinopoly municipality on the report of the Inspector of Municipalities ; and

(b) whether the chairman of the municipality has been refused to be furnished with copies of a large number of paragraphs from the report of the Inspector of Municipalities ; if so, why he was so refused ?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) Copies of relevant portions of the report were given.

Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ With reference to the answer to clause (b) stating that the chairman was supplied with copies of relevant portion, may I know whether the chairman was refused to be furnished with the other portions and if so the reason why ?”

Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB :—“ Were the other portions irrelevant ?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Only those paragraphs which required the explanation of the chairman were sent to him.”

Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ The whole report related to the administration of the municipality by the chairman and may I know the reasons why only some portions were given and not others ?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Only such portions on which the explanation of the chairman was found necessary were given to him.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“ Did the other portions contain confidential aspersions against the chairman ?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ No, Sir. It was considered unnecessary to furnish him with the other portions.”

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—“ Did they affect him ?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ No, they did not affect him.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask whether copies of the irrelevant portions also were given to him before final orders were passed ?”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I should like to have notice of it.”

318 Q.—[Cancelled.]



[4th March 1925]

*A new proposal for collection of municipal taxes.*

\* 319 Q.—Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state and place on the table of the Council—

(a) a comparative statement of the amount of taxes collected during the periods of 1920 to 1922 and 1922 to 1924 ;

(b) whether there is a proposal or scheme whereby the collection of municipal taxes within the municipalities will be delegated to deputy collectors ;

(c) if so, the other proposals in connexion therewith ; and

(d) how long this scheme is under the contemplation of the Government ?

A.—(a) It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to taxes collected by municipal councils. The councils collected the following amounts of taxes during 1920 to 1922 and 1922 to 1924 :—

|              |     |     |     | RS.         |
|--------------|-----|-----|-----|-------------|
| 1920 to 1922 | ... | ... | ... | 81,47,209   |
| 1922 to 1924 | ... | ... | ... | 1,05,24,620 |

(b) to (d) The Government have no such proposals under their consideration.

*Mangalore Taluk Board.*

\* 320 Q.—Mr. K. RAGHUCHANDRA BALLAL: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the President of the Mangalore Taluk Board in South Kanara was taken suddenly ill and unconscious in December 1924 and became incapacitated for discharging his duties as president ;

(b) whether, during such incapacity of the said president, the vice-president of the said board was performing the president's duties for a few days till the vice-president left Mangalore for Bombay ;

(c) whether it is a fact that during the absence of the vice-president, a letter was written purporting to have been communicated by the said president under his facsimile seal authorizing one of the members resident in the Mangalore town to perform all the duties of the president until the latter became free from the said incapacity or until the vice-president returned to Mangalore ;

(d) whether it is a fact that such authorization has not been recognized by the Treasury Deputy Collector of South Kanara and that as a consequence all payments of salaries payable to the several establishments under the said board have been withheld causing great distress to the recipients concerned ;

(e) whether it is a fact that the said president having died on 7th January 1925 all correspondence addressed to the President, Mangalore Taluk Board, now remains piled up and untouched by the said member whose powers under such delegation have not been recognized ;

(f) whether it is a fact that the president of the district board has not made any arrangements for the proper discharge, by any person duly and legally authorized, of the duties of President of the Mangalore Taluk Board ;

(g) the reasons for the non-interference of the said district board president in the circumstances of the case ; and